

# Advisory Team: Accountability Task Force

## MINUTES

JANUARY 20, 2017

9:00AM-12:00PM Londergan Hall, Room 15, Concord, NH

ADVISORY TEAM LEADS	Scott Mantie, Paul Leather, and Sandra MacDonald, NH DOE
CONSULTANTS	Scott Marion and Susan Lyons, Center for Assessment
NOTE TAKER	Susan Lyons, Center for Assessment
ATTENDEES	Winfried Feneberg, Robert Malay, Jim O'Rourke, Natasha Kolehmainen, Scott Marion, Susan Lyons, Patrick Connors, Irv Richardson, George Shea, Chris Demers, Ellen Hume-Howard, Nancy Stiles, Nate Greenberg, Lorraine Tacconi-Moore, Minday Ryan, Mary Claire Barry, Donna Crook, Julie Heon, Paul Leather, Dave Backler,
OBSERVERS	Dan Vallore, Jerry Frew, Keith Burke,
PRE-READ MATERIALS	NH Accountability Task Force Report_011717

DISCUSSION	
<b>OBJECTIVES FOR MEETING:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reviewing draft accountability report</li> <li>2. Making recommendations for outstanding issues <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Indexing and reporting indicators—levels, process, grain size, reporting?</li> <li>b. Getting to overall determinations—methods, choices</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
9:00	<b>Welcome and Policy Updates</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Paul Leather and Scott Mantie, NH DOE</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Paul Leather opens the meeting by discussing the NHDOE's intention to submit the state plan in June 2017. He underscores the importance of this meeting and the need to come to agreement on the major parts of the accountability plan written into the pre-reading draft documents.</p>
9:15	<b>Walking through the draft report</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scott Marion, Susan Lyons, Center for Assessment</li> </ul> <p><u>Discussion:</u> The Task Force members were given 15 minutes to re-familiarize themselves with the draft accountability plan document. Scott Marion introduces the indexing system to the task force and its utility for providing feedback to districts and for creating meaningful overall determinations. In small groups, the task force discusses their impression of the overall models, the indexing systems, and any other issues they want to raise. After the small group discussions, Scott brings the group together to discuss their impressions and comments on the draft. One task force member asks for clarity around the calculation of the equity indicator. There is some discussion about the operationalization of the lowest 25%. One task force member comments that focusing on the lowest 25% is helpful for schools to resist the temptation to focus on the "bubble students" who are near proficient. Another task force member suggests taking a three-year average to help with the consistency for schools and Scott responds that averaging is a good idea for identification of schools for comprehensive support. Some members are worried about high performing schools on the equity indicator, for example, if all of your students are above proficient but not growing quickly, this indicator could still be low. Scott responds by re-familiarizing the task force with the properties of the student growth percentile model to explain why this would not be the case. Scott asks the task force to weigh in on defining the lowest 25% as lowest achievers or those below proficient. There is some support from the task force for using the lowest 25% or the number of students below proficient, whichever is fewer students. The task force is not able to come to consensus on this so Scott offers that the Center for Assessment model the business rule decisions to see how the different scenarios could play out in the data (e.g., number of schools meeting minimum n, demographics of schools scoring high/low, influence of number of students within school).</p> <p>The discussion then moved to the High School model and Scott solicited comments from the task force after a break for small group discussion. One task force members suggested a three-year average for the SAT, additionally, he asked about how military readiness fits into the post-secondary readiness model. Other task force members echoed that yes, military readiness should be part of the model. The task force then moved into discussing the option of recommending the PSAT, many of the member districts already use PSAT as part of their local assessment systems. The discussion leads the task force to a conversation about the definition of college ready. One task force member says any two of the following would be acceptable for meet the criteria for "college ready": NH scholars program of student, college-ready SAT score, or successful completion of a college-level course such as AP, IB, or dual enrollment course. The task force discusses what combination of indicators would qualify as college ready; one suggestion is that a college-level course (with credit-bearing score or grade) is enough to determine college readiness. Scott Marion clarifies that the indicator will be reported based on each student's entire high school career, senior year courses can count in the calculation of the indicator. For the career and college ready (CCR) index one task force member requests that we can include any SAT score that the student</p>

received, not just the accountability test score. Scott says that yes, this can be done. Another task force member suggests adding "college acceptance" as an additional indicator. Many of the task force members agree that two out of the three listed indicators in the report are acceptable in addition to high school graduation. One task force member argues that a high school diploma should be enough, and if it is not enough, we need to rethink the requirements for the high school diploma. Scott responds by saying that if schools see a disconnection between graduation rates and CCR index, they would try and reconcile those two. Paul Leather puts forth the suggestion that students need just one CCR indicators in addition to attendance and graduation. With some discussion, Scott asks for a show of hands voting for how many of the three indicators should be required for the CCR index and the majority of the task force expressed favor for one out of three in addition to high school graduation.

**11:15 Key outstanding issues: indicator values and overall determinations**

✓ Scott Marion, Center for Assessment

Discussion: The conversation moves to the discussion of indices, 1-4, for every indicator. Scott explains that the indices help translate the raw metrics into something that is more interpretable for the public. Additionally, if all of the indices are on a 1-4 scale, the public has a sense of how schools are stacking up on each of the indicators. Scott Mantie speaks in favor of the four-point score scale since there is going to be continuity with how the assessment scores are reported. One task force member in favor of indexing also raises the point that performance level descriptors for each index score will be important. The task force is in agreement about the merits of the indexing system but is interested into getting into the discussion about the specifics of the decision matrices for determining the overall school rating. Scott provides an overview of how the decision matrices would work, and promises more work for future task force meetings around designing the matrices.

**12:00 Adjourn**

**CONCLUSIONS**

Thank you for the valuable participation and input from the task force members. We will work to incorporate the Task Force's suggestions into the draft accountability system report to present to the Task Force for feedback. As with other meetings, any relevant pre-reading materials will be sent in advance.

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Update accountability report draft	Center for Assessment	TBD
Pre-reading	Task Force	TBD